

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Specification and Claims

The grammatical error noted in item 2 on page 2 of the Official Action has been corrected by changing “an use” to –use–. It is noted, however, that the error occurred on page 6 and not page 9, as indicated in the Official Action.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4. Amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth below.

Finally, claim 2 has been re-written in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1, from which it originally depended. Claim 2 is indicated as allowable of page 5 of the Official Action.

Because the changes to the specification and claims are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that they do not involve “new matter.”

2. Rejection of Claims 4-6 Under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph

This rejection has been addressed by adopting the “adapted to” language suggested by the Examiner. The PC is in fact claimed *functionally* and not *positively*. It is noted that the limitations of claim 4 are now included in claim 1.

3. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,522,364 (Charney) and 6,216,316 (Errichiello)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Charney and Errichiello patents fails to disclose or suggest the feature, originally recited in claim 4 and now recited in claim 1, of a portable computer support structure having a coupling portion that is comprised of

Serial Number 10/799,624

a pair of **sliding rails** adapted to be respectively coupled to a pair of **sliding grooves** in a portable computer.

Instead, the Charney patent discloses an inclining **desk top** with no provision for attachment of a portable computer or any other object or device, much less by means of “*sliding rails adapted to be respectively coupled to a pair of sliding grooves*” of the PC, as claimed. The desk top of Charney supports a book 46, but the book simply leans against platform 30 and is not attached thereto.

The Errichiello patent does not make up for Charney’s lack of attachment rails since the Charney patent discloses a **hinge** that is designed to be screwed to a door. There is no suggestion of, or need for, sliding rails, much less sliding rails adapted to attach a portable computer as claimed.

The inclusion of rails enables the stand of the claimed invention to be easily yet securely attached to the portable computer, while permitting the computer to also be easily removed after use. The two references do not disclose any sort of personal computer stand, or even a stand that enables an object of any kind to be easily and securely attached, and also easily removed. There is no suggestion whatsoever of applying the desk top of Charney or the hinge of Errichiello to a personal computer. In fact, attachment of a hinge to a personal computer by using screws as taught by Errichiello would likely damage the personal computer.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have thought to apply the hinge of Errichiello to either a personal computer as claimed, *or* to a book as disclosed by Charney, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that the combination proposed by the Examiner is non-obvious and would not have resulted in the claimed invention. As a result, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial Number 10/799,624

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', written over a horizontal line.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: March 22, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

N:\B.S\Producer\Bou\Pending A...IFC\CHEN 799624u01.wpd